

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. Claims 1, 3-4 and 9-10 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the claim amendments.

Specification

The summary and abstract of the instant application are amended in response to the issues raised in the instant Office Action.

112 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 3-6 and 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for reasons cited in the instant Office Action. Claims 3-4 and 9-10 are amended to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. By virtue of their dependency on Claims 3-4 and 9-10, Claims 5-6 and 11-12 also satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

101 Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claim 1 is amended to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101. By virtue of their dependency on Claim 1, Claims 2-6 also satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101.

102(b) Rejections

The instant Office Action states that Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hundt, "HP Caliper – An Architecture for Performance Analysis Tools." The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the present invention as recited in Claims 1-18 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Hundt.

Independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 recite either “using a performance analysis tool to perform a desired task on said inlined function” or “performing a desired task on said inlined function using a performance analysis tool” (emphasis added). Applicants respectfully submit that using a performance analysis tool to perform a task on an inlined function is not shown or suggested by Hundt.

Hundt describes a performance analysis tool. Hundt also mentions inlined functions. However, Hundt does not teach or suggest using a performance analysis tool on an inlined function, as recited in independent Claims 1, 7 and 13. As mentioned in the background art section of the instant application, at the time of the present claimed invention, conventional performance analysis tools could not be used to analyze inlined functions. Applicants respectfully submit that Hundt is simply an example of the conventional art.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claimed invention as recited in independent Claims 1, 7 and 13 is not shown or suggested by Hundt. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed, and that these claims are in condition for allowance. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that the basis for rejecting Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is also traversed, as these claims are dependent on allowable base claims and contain additional limitations that are patentably distinguishable over Hundt.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-18 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.


Applicants have reviewed the references cited but not relied upon (see the Notice of References Cited in the instant Office Action). Applicants did not find those references to show or suggest the present claimed invention.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 1/5/04



John P. Wagner, Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060